5 SEP 1969

The Honorable Emanuel Celler, Chairman Committee on the Judiciary House of Representatives
Washington, D. C. 20515

My dear Mr. Chairman:

This is in response to your request for a report on H.R. 4665, a private bill for the relief of

STATINTL

This Agency executed a personal services contract with on 17 October 1957. The contract reflected the intended employer-employee relationship to be established and, in addition to a stipulated per annum compensation, included provisions for reimbursement of authorized travel, Federal Employees' Compensation Act benefits, Social Security coverage, and sick and annual leave.

STATINTL

STATINTL

In 1962 the Army, in conformance with 42 Comptroller General 9, reduced the retired pay of to bring his combined contract and retired pay within the \$10,000 annual limitation imposed by Section 212, Act of 30 June 1932, as amended. then negotiated a reduction in his contract compensation from \$9,215 to \$7,397.68 per annum to permit the Army to reinstate his tax-exempt retired pay at the full rate without exceeding the \$10,000 limitation.

On 19 August 1964 military retirements similar to TINTL were exempted from the \$10,000 annual limitation on the concurrent receipt of civilian compensation and retired pay (P.L. 88-448, Section 201(g)). That law also authorized the retroactive payment of military pay at the full rate in such cases.

M.E. 4665 provides for the payment to "... STATINTL the sum of \$3,634.64 in full settlement of all his claims against the United States arising in connection with a reduction in his salary for the period beginning October 1, 1962, and ending October 30, 1964, while he was a contract employee of the Central Intelligence gency.

The amount set forth in H.R. 4665 equals the gross difference

between the per annual compensation paid under the contract from 1 October 1962 through 30 September 1964 and the amount which would have been paid had the per annum compensation remained at the 30 September 1962 rate. The contract expired on 30 October 1964. Following the enactment of P. L. 88-448.

The payment was not made, on the basis that the compensation which was in effect over the period in question had been agreed to by both parties and that there was no consideration to

support the payment of any other amount.

STATINTL

STATINTL

In light of the above we have no basis for recommending favorable action on the bill. If the Congress should decide that relief is warranted, we believe that any tax advantage which received during the period in question should be effect against any award.

The Bureau of the Eudget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely,

Richard Helms Director

Distribution:

Orig. & 3 - Addressee

1 - DCI

1 - DDCI

1 - ER

1 - General Counsel

1 - DD/P

1 - DD/S

-1 - OLC Chrono

1 - OLC Subj (House Judiciary & Hoose files)

OLC/LLM:rw (14 Feb 69)

Approved to 3. Belease, 2001 to 7/262:8C Mark DF 7/12-00337 R000100140029-2